JANUARY 1954
VOL. III No. 1

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

Comments on Recent Nomenclatural Proposals

by

F. R. Fosberg (Falls Church, Va)

The purpose of published discussion of proposed amendments to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature and of other nomenclatural matters is, presumably, to give the botanical public a better chance to weigh and consider the opinions and ideas advanced than is afforded in the rapid give and take on the floor of a sectional meeting of a congress. On this basis a few alternative opinions to some expressed in recent articles in Taxon may be appropriate.

1. It is certainly with grave misgivings that I read Rickett's suggestion (Taxon 2: 117-124. 1953) of a further departure from the principle of priority in the direction of expediency.

A veritable tendency of human beings is the demand for panaceas to alleviate all ills. The present clamor for names based on official fiat seems to be an example. It is hoped that, despite such distinguished support as that of Dr Rickett, the good sense of the majority of taxonomists will prevail as it has preponderantly in the past, and that the trend that is alluded to in the article cited will be slackened and eventually stopped.

Several years ago I expressed my opinions on the subject of "official plant names" and do not intend to repeat those remarks. I would merely like to add that experience gained during the past year from evaluating but a few of the proposals for additions to the list of Nomina Generica Conservanda has demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that if this trend is "widened" a full-time staff of competent botanists will be necessary to do nothing else than consider proposals for "registration" of "satisfactory typification" of "all names". And, equally certain, on the basis of this experience, is my opinion that no really good botanists would consider doing such work on a full-time basis, at least after the first three months. It is one thing to indulge in occasional tasks of this dull, frustrating, and exasperating sort as a public service to the rest of botany, but to make one's living doing it is almost inconceivable, unless jobs of any other sort were not to be had. And this would automatically select the most incompetent botanists for the task.

The choice between priority and expediency is the choice between a relatively simple code, such as the present botanical one, which will enable anyone in possession of the facts to arrive at a correct decision as to a correct name, and an accumulation of judicial opinion that is impossible to utilize except by submission to a court to have rendered additional judicial opinion. Anyone who doubts this may simply look at the situation in zoology. There, in the past very few years, has been built up a thick volume of fine print — committee opinions carrying the

weight of law — that make the present International Code of Botanical Nomenclature seem like an elementary grade primer by comparison. It is not for nothing that we more and more frequently hear zoologists speak with envy of the "simple and workable botanical rules".

2. In Dr Sprague's otherwise excellent reply (Taxon 2: 131-133. 1953) to Dr Baehni's suggestions is one statement that, coming from the dean of nomenclaturists, might work much mischief. He says (p. 132, Art. 69) that "a name or epithet may be legitimate, and yet not validly published". In my understanding this cannot possibly be true. Art. 10 of the Code says that "A *legitimate* name or epithet is one that is in accordance with the rules." Art. 22 says that "A name of a taxon has no status under this Code, and no claim to recognition by botanists, unless it is validly published". Certainly, then, a name that is not validly published is not in accordance with Art. 22, and therefore cannot be legitimate.

3. In a previous article (Taxon 2: 99-101. 1953) I have expressed my opinions on the matter of conservation of *Citrullus*, which are, to some extent, contrary to those of Hara (Taxon 2: 134-135. 1953). They still seem correct. One further fact should be pointed out. *Citrullus anguria* (Duch.) Hara, if intended to be published, is illegitimate, since *Cucurbita anguria* Duch. in Lamarck was superfluous when published and therefore illegitimate (Art. 73-1), as *Cucurbita citrullus* L. was cited in synonymy and is an earlier available name.

4. Corner's proposal no. 10 (Taxon 2: 101. 1953), as with most other proposals and suggestions that only monographers should make nomenclatural decisions, is ideal but quite impractical. If there were a monographer available for every genus it might be possible to defer such decisions to him. But as it is, names must be used now and monographers are really rather few in comparison with genera. And they are not all good monographers and not all of them have sound ideas on nomenclature. The names proposed for addition to the lists of Nomina Generica Conservanda and Rejicienda are cases in point. The proposers are really obliged by the rules to select a type, if one is not already designated. If they fail to do it, the member of the Special Committee involved whose job it is to evaluate the proposal must select the type in order to make it clear what genus he is talking about and to conform with Art. 24 Note 2. My suggestion is that Appendix I be left unamended long enough to see if it works, and that botanists faced with the necessity of selecting a type be encouraged to utilize all of the facts available to them in applying the directions given in Appendix I.

5. Pichi-Sermolli's proposal (Taxon 2: 136-137. 1953) to establish a list of "lectotype species selected conventionally" to be officially retained for "genera of uncertain or questionable typification" seems to offer merely another means of avoiding proper study of the facts in a problem. If a name cannot be satisfactorily typified it should be regarded as a *nomen dubium* until it can be (see proposal of Art. 75, Taxon 2: 109. 1953). If it can be, there is no need to place its type on any such list.

6. Croizat, in his intemperate and impolite article entitled "On nomenclature: the 'type method' " (Taxon 2: 105-107, 124-130. 1953), demonstrates a confusion of thinking far surpassing that of most or all of those he is criticizing. The speciousness of his distinction between physical and nomenclatorial types should scarcely need pointing out. If the superficial distinction he indicates between these two is maintained, then he has completely failed to show where they are in conflict

in effect, in spite of all the vituperation. Nowhere in the section on the type method is there anything that indicates that when subdivisions of taxa are regarded as types of these taxa they are so regarded in any sense other than as typified by their own types, going down, eventually, to a specimen. So why all of this fuss about it. It seems clear enough that, basically, an order is a group of families, a family a group of genera, a genus a group of species, and a species a group of individuals, and that the type of each of these is a member of the group of which it is made up. The intermediate and lower categories are merely subgroups and to be typified exactly as are the groups of which they are a part.

The confusion that still exists in the minds of some, apparently even including Croizat, between nomenclatural and biological types is an unfortunate result of a poor choice of the word "type" for the nomenclatural use. If the word often seen in German "Original" had been chosen there might never have been much of an argument over the type method. The philosophically more desirable practice of fixing a name to a circumscription rather than to a specimen or member of a higher group, though ideal, would inevitably have given way to the infinitely more practical method now in the Code.

No particular fault can be found with his condensed statement at the bottom of page 127, except that it is such an unchewable mouthful, but it does not seem to say anything different than what the Code says at present.

In the whole article the only sound point seems to be that made on pp. 129-130 concerning the provision in Art. 35 that the author's name is not to be cited for the typical subdivision of a species. In practice I have already found this omission clumsy and undesirable. It would certainly be an advantage to be able to give a reference to the publication of such a name. I have previously proposed a slight modification of this point (Taxon 2: 108. 1953) to permit use of a parenthetical author. It would doubtless be better to delete altogether the part of Art. 35 reading "but, contrary to Art. 55, without citation of an author's name."

Histoire et état actuel de l'herbier MERINO

par

Manuel Lainz, S. J. (Comillas-Espagne)

Dans les travaux de systématique végétale, en particulier en ce qui concerne la révision des genres ibériques, on cite exclusivement, comme herbier du P. Baltasar Merino, S. J. (± 1917), celui qui se trouve actuellement à la Faculté des Sciences de Santiago de Compostela.

Quelques déficiences de cet herbier ont été signalées. Nous avions nous-même constaté des lacunes sur certains points en le consultant à Comillas, grâce à la complaisance et à l'amabilité de son détenteur, le Docteur Luis Iglesias. Nous venons de nous convaincre néanmoins de ce que cet herbier contient plusieurs exemplaires uniques, gracieusement cédés à l'Université galicienne par son collecteur, ancien Président de l'Académie Internationale de Géographie Botanique.

D'ailleurs, ces 2.080 parts qu'il a étiquetés *) avec soin représentent en général

*) Elles sont classées suivant l'ordre préconisé par Willkomm pour les familles, et suivant celui de la *Flora de Galicia* pour les genres, espèces, etc. Des centaines de parts supplémentaires qui, d'après ce que nous en a dit le docteur Iglesias, lui furent confiées par le Collège de Vigo des mois après la mort du Père, présentent beaucoup moin de valeur.

les unités systématiques les mieux définiés. Elles ont un but précis que nous pourrions appeler "présentation synthétique de la flore régionale". Il est en effet évident qu'une oeuvre aussi analytique que la *Flora de Galicia* ne peut avoir eu comme base qu'une accumulation considérable de matériaux.

Cet herbier fondamental, conservé à Lourizán (Pontevedra), est constitué par des dizaines de milliers de parts dont nous venons également de faire un premier examen. D'une façon générale leur conservation est satisfaisante. Malgré une ou deux lacunes importantes, nous trouverons là un travail précieux pour la botanique espagnole.

Nous avons été frappé par la manière dont le P. Merino a su orienter ses acquisitions extragaliciennes et étrangères. La main de son ami Pau y transparaît fréquemment, et pas seulement sur les étiquettes qui proviennent de l'*Herbarium Hispanicum* ou des *Plantas Espanolas*. Mais il est évident que pendant ces quelque vingt-cinq ans de travaux botaniques qui remplirent le dernier tiers de sa vie, sa spécialisation ne l'empêcha pas de maintenir activement des échanges qui lui permirent de résoudre avec sécurité beaucoup des problèmes régionaux. En fait, rares sont les botanistes français contemporains dont le nom ne figure pas sur les étiquettes de ces parts supplémentaires. La *Flora* garde le témoignage de ces relations entretenues avec les savants éminents des autres pays.

Des additions inédites à la *Flora de Galicia* viennent de paraître dans la revue *Brotéria* qui publiait les travaux derniers du P. Merino. Nous étudions en outre des centaines de parts dignes d'intérêt, qui montrent ce qu'on peut tirer de l'herbier non encore exploité.

Pour ceux qui s'intéressent à cet herbier, nous allons donner un bref aperçu des vicissitudes de ce trésor scientifique soigneusement conservé depuis quelques années par le Centre Régional Forestier d'Enseignements, Recherche et Expérimentation. Il appartient au Collège Saint Jacques de Vigo qui l'avait hérité du Collège d'El Pasaje (La Guardia), et jusqu'à la dispersion de la Compagnie de Jésus par la République sectaire, il y fut conservé avec un soin jaloux. On assure que les chemises intérieures furent changées à plusieurs reprises sous la direction du P. V. Mayordomo (tué en 1936 à Santander). Lorsque les Jésuites durent s'exiler au Portugal, une de leurs préoccupations fut de sauver l'herbier. Ils rencontrèrent l'aide d'amis dévoués qui le recueillirent chez eux.

Quelques années plus tard, l'oeuvre du P. Merino se retrouvait dans l'établissement balnéaire de Mondariz qui abritait provisoirement le Collège pendant la guerre espagnole. Du point de vue technique, les conditions climatiques et le logement s'avérèrent détestables, et le P. J. del Portillo dut la défendre avec acharnement contre les moisissures. Nous pouvons constater qu'il y réussit et que très peu de parts en portent des traces.

Notre herbier voyait arriver la fin de ses aventures; il fut ramené à Vigo, mais l'étroitesse des locaux du Collège en développement rendait impossible une installation convenable. Craignant des avaries difficiles à éviter, le R. P. Recteur P. Pardo entreprit des démarches pour le confier au Centre de Lourizán, et le 21 Novembre 1945, signait un accord de dépôt avec l'ingénieur Directeur, M. I. Marcide. Depuis, le patrimoine botanique du Collège est royalement hébergé dans le Palais historique qui abrite le Centre. Espérons qu'après avoir été soigneusement catalogué il deviendra facilement accessible à tous les chercheurs qui s'intéressent à la flore ibérique.

Precision in Taxonomic Terminology

by

Richard S. Cowan (New York)

At times it has been said of taxonomy that this branch of botany is more an art than a science. This point of view, which most taxonomists find disturbing but which they do little to correct, may appear to contain an element of truth when we consider the lack of precision in the terminology used to characterize plants. One is taught that science rests, or is based, upon certain sound, immutable laws, and, if this is true, then the terminology which is employed in scientific writing should also be concise and readily comprehensible, at least to another specialist in the same field. In the physical and physico-botanical sciences these conditions are much more nearly realized than in botanical taxonomy. Some of the difficulties are perhaps impossible to resolve, but it is assuredly time that we taxonomists made a serious attempt to standardize our terminology. This is not a new problem, but one which has vexed every student of the science since Linnaeus with even a remote inclination for order. There have been numerous attempts at definition of terms, then re-definition and more re-definition, so that by now there is near chaos in the meaning of much of our terminology. Confusion reigns when we compare the diverse definitions given by various authors for terms descriptive of the vesture, outline and form, fruits, and inflorescences. Dr G. M. Schulze (Bot. Jahrb. 76: 109-133. 1953) has made the most recent attempt to clarify the meanings of the terms applied to the outline of plant structures and organs. For an excellent introduction to this needlessly distressing situation, see the paper by Rickett soon to be published in the Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club. He points out the many ways in which some of our terms have been employed — so many ways, in fact, that they have largely lost any precise meaning they may once have possessed. If our botanical language has reached this state now, what meaning will it have after another two hundred years? But the purpose of the present writer is not to anticipate this work but to suggest a possible means of partial escape from the morass of confusion in which many of us find ourselves mired.

It appears that we might improve the situation by a careful selection of reference species or specimens for each term — much in the same manner by which we designate type specimens. The first step in such a plan might be the organization of an international committee consisting of active, interested taxonomists who would after careful deliberation construct definitions which, because of their etymological correctness and/or preponderance of usage, would be acceptable to the majority of the committee. This, you may justifiably remark, only compounds and possibly perpetuates past errors, or the existing confusion might even be increased by the addition of a totally new connotation to a term. But it would be the second duty of this committee to select reference species (one or more than one) and to distribute to all the major botanical centers of the world duplicate specimens of the species selected to illustrate each term. Because the taxonomists in each region of the world would be more familiar with their local species, a reference example would be designated for each major geographic area. The terms, then, would have as an illustration a different species in each area. Narrow endemics would obviously be of no use in this connection and more widespread plants would be better for the purpose, provided they were not too variable! Every effort should be taken to choose stable species, since the specimens may not always be available and future students might revert to living plants. The choice of the reference species and the collection of voucher specimens from a single individual (where possible) of that

species should be made by a reliable student of the flora of each region and submitted to the committee for judgement of its suitability as an illustration of the pre-determined definition. In the future a student then would be able to grasp the meaning of a term, if not by the committee's words, at least by the reference specimen — exactly in the same manner as we refer to the type collection of a species to confirm what we suspect from the original description.

Postscript by the Chief Editor

I am of course very glad with this plea for a standardization of our phytographic terminology. Indeed: the project was already on the 1935 program of the commission for urgent taxonomic needs and it has also been put on the original program of the I.A.P.T. The reason that so far nothing has been done is that we have not been able to find a competent botanist willing to put his shoulders under it. I know that the subject has also been discussed by the A.E.T.F.A.T. but I am not informed with regard to the progress made by that organization.

Quite recently a special committee for the revision of the whole botanical terminology was established by the I.U.B.S., and I believe that, thanks to the activity and energy of Dr Motte, the secretary of that committee, there are good prospects for the realization of at least part of this project. At the Paris Congress a special section organized by Dr Motte will be devoted to the discussion of this plan. Dr Cowan's suggestion to make a kind of type collection to illustrate the phytographic terms is a very interesting one, but I believe that our most urgent needs will be satisfied by a well illustrated phytographic dictionary. The comparison of a sufficiently large collection of "type specimens", will, as a rule, require too much time.

Proposed Amendments to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

A. Proposals by Harold St John (Honolulu)

Proposal no. 77

Article 18

Delete the last sentence of the first paragraph, reading: "It follows that the name of a taxon must be changed if the type of the name is excluded."

Argument: The type and the name of the taxon are inseparable. If an older taxon is newly found to be heterogeneous, the name and the type of the taxon remain together in the newer, more narrowly delimited taxon, while its other elements are removed and given other recognition or placement. It is, however, understood that rarely a generic name is conserved by the Congress in a later sense, with the original type excluded, but this is unusual and special legislation. It should not be mentioned in the basic article on the type method. No individual botanist can exclude the type from a named taxon and no statement should appear in the rules that implies that he can do so. Art. 57 also applies here, and covers details of conservation.

Article 24 (Note 1, line 4)

Change: "Committee, who will refer them ...." to read: "Committee, which will refer them...."

Argument: This is a needed grammatical correction.

Recommendation 30 A (c)

Delete the word "barbarous", and change the sentence to read: "Not to take names from languages other than Latin or Greek, unless those names are frequently cited in books of travel, etc...."

Argument: It is needlessly offensive to have one's modern language called

"barbarous". Since this recommendation is only an admonition, and a botanist may, despite it, chose a generic name from a word in any language, it would be better not to designate as barbarous all languages other than Latin.

Article 31

Paragraph two and three should be removed from the article, and made Rec. 31A. The wording to remain unchanged:

"For subgenera and sections such epithets are usually substantives resembling the names of genera."

"For subsections and lower subdivisions the epithets are preferably plural adjectives agreeing in gender with the generic name and written with a capital initial letter, or their place may be taken by an ordinal number or a letter."

Argument: The wording of these paragraphs is not mandatory or retroactive, so they do not have the effect of an article or law. They belong with the recommendations.

Article 32

Line one, after "subgenus", insert: "section, or other subdivision of a genus." Line two, for "that name", read: "the same unaltered name".

The article when thus amended will read: "The subgenus, section, or other subdivision of a genus containing the type species of the genus must bear the same unaltered name as that of the genus."

Argument: This article follows Art. 31 which defines the nature of the names of the subdivisions of a genus. Art. 32 as adopted in 1950 provides that the "alpha" or type subgenus must bear the same name unaltered, as *Croton,* subgenus *Croton* (not subgenus *Eluteria*). The provisions of Art. 64 (3) make clear that this same method must be applied not only to the typical subgenus, but to the typical section, subsection, and any other taxon intermediate between genus and species. For consistency and clarity, then, Art. 32 should be so worded as to clearly apply to all taxa between genus and species.

Recommendation 33A

Add to the end of the last sentence: "or a notable botanist or person who is thus honored."

Argument: This addition to the sentence will apply to those commonly given epithets that honor a worthy person who was in no way connected with the discovery of or investigation of that particular plant.

Recommendation 33C (h)

Rec. 33C (h). Delete the words: "or more". Then the recommendation will read: "To avoid specific epithets formed of two hyphenated words."

Argument: Since Art. 33 validates epithets of two words (which originally were joined or subsequently are to be joined by a hyphen), it makes illegitimate any epithet formed of three or more words. To be consistent with the provisions of Art. 33, the words "or more" should be deleted from Rec. 33C (h).

Article 39

Art. 39. In paragraph three, for "in newspapers", read: "in general and non-scientific newspapers". The amended sentence would then read:

"On and from 1 Jan. 1953 the publication of a new name in tradesmen's catalogues or in general and non-scientific newspapers, even if accompanied by a Latin diagnosis, does not constitute effective publication."

Argument: The distinction made in this article is just, and it is well to rule out future publication of taxa in the public press, but it is difficult to draw the line between some newspapers and some scientific journals. Would the mere word newspaper exclude *Science* or the *Gardeners' Chronicle*? The rewording proposed above, would make it easier to draw the line of distinction between scientific news journals and newspapers.

Article 39 (Note)

In the first paragraph of the note, for the word "holographic", substitute the word: "handwritten". The note will then read:

"Note. For the purposes of this Article handwritten material, even though reproduced by some mechanical or graphic process (such as lithography, offset, metallic etching or microfilm) is still considered autographic."

Argument: This note intends to exclude as not effectively published, any publication duplicated from an autographic original. The word "holographic" by definition applies only to a manuscript written by one person. It does not clearly apply to a similar manuscript in the handwriting of two or more botanists, or a botanist and his secretary, his wife, or other relatives, or assistants.

By substituting the word "handwritten", the provision of the law will apply to all such similar manuscripts whether written in the hand of one or more persons.

Article 42

Repeal the next to the last paragraph, as follows:

"Examples of combinations not definitely indicated: Rafinesque's statement that '*Monarda ciliata* must form a new genus, which we will call *Blephilia*' does not constitute publication of the combination *Blephilia ciliata*, since he did not indicate that the combination was to be used. Similarly the combination *Eulophus peucedanoides* must not be ascribed to Bentham and Hooker f. on the basis of listing *Cnidium peucedanoides* H.B.K. under *Eulophus* in the *Genera Plantarum*."

Argument: These examples are new, and they are the negative ones illustrating the application of the new (Stockholm, 1950) paragraph of the article:

"No combination is validly published unless the author definitely indicates that the epithet or epithets concerned are to be combined with the generic name in a particular way."

As examples of names to be accepted are those by Linnaeus, Miller, Steudel, and W. Watson. The essence of this rule is that the only acceptable binomials are those that were published in juxtaposition, or in a tabular arrangement, while those that occur in some other arrangement as in a running text are unacceptable. Until 1950 there was no such regulation and taxonomists judged each obscure act or proposal in publication on what the author did or indicated an intention of doing. Personally, I found this article, as stated in the previous International Rules, adequate and easy to apply.

The current Art. 42 forces us to judge the validity of a publication on the printing of the generic name and the specific epithet together or in some particular formula. The examples used as illustrations are very unfortunate. Rafinesque's work is rejected. Now, I would vote with enthusiasm for the outlawing of all the botanical names published by that inconsistent and troublesome individual, but no Congress has ever succeeded in outlawing the work of anyone, sane or insane, scientist or fiction writer, so Rafinesque's work must be sifted and the botanical proposals evaluated on the same basis as those of anyone else. How can it be correctly stated that "Rafinesque's statement ... does not constitute publication of the combination *Blephilia ciliata*, since he did not indicate that the combination was to be used."? Rafinesque, at this place, was clear and lucid, and he said, "*Monarda ciliata* must form a new genus, which we will call *Blephilia*." Rafinesque here gave a fully clear indication that he proposed the new monotypic genus *Blephilia* Raf., basing it solely upon *Monarda ciliata* L. which provided the basonym and the type. How can we say that Rafinesque did not indicate the type? The dictionaries define the word "to indicate", as meaning: "To point out"; "to suggest"; etc. As I see it Rafinesque gave a crystal clear indication that he proposed the new genus and the new combination *Blephilia ciliata*. Granted that Rafinesque is unpopular and that if examples of a depreciated practice are drawn from his writings, they add a stigma to the practice illustrated, but the 1950 rule is certainly wrong in saying that Rafinesque did not indicate that the combination was to be used. The example drawn from Bentham and Hooker f. is similar, as the authors accepted a genus and listed as one of the three species the third one with the basonym *Cnidium peucedanoides* H.B.K. Until 1950 no one found this method obscure or unacceptable. All botanists understood that *Cnidium* Nutt. was published and that the combination *C. peucedanoides* (H.B.K.) B. & H. was indicated. This method of publication has long been accepted. It is essentially: I publish the new genus, or accept the genus, *Eulophus*, and include in it the species which H.B.K. called *Cnidium peucedanoides*. The indication of intent is clear, as is also the indication that the epithet is "to be combined with the generic name in a particular way."

We must also examine those binomials cited in the code as validly published since "the author definitely indicates that the epithet or epithets concerned are to be combined with the generic name in a particular way." The status of the names published by Linnaeus in his Species Plantarum (1753), the beginning point of our binomial nomenclature, is familiar to all. The generic name appears as a centered heading. The trivial name appears only in the margin. This was not the specific name of Linnaeus, but through the subsequent growth of the binary system it has come to be accepted as the specific epithet. The binomial does not ap-

pear in a key or in his index. At no place in his Species Plantarum edition one, or in his later editions, is the specific epithet printed in juxtaposition immediately following the generic name. Even so, we agree that Linnaeus here started the binomial system and we agree to use the name with the specific epithet immediately following the generic name. Basic works for another half century followed Linnaeus' method, viz. those by Thunberg, Hudson, Aiton, Michaux, Pursh, et al.

Now, we are instructed by Article 42 and by the Examples, that the binary name must have been combined in a particular way (but what particular way is not stated). Miller's works beginning in 1768 are specified as acceptable since he put parentheses around the specific epithet, thus separating it from the other words of the polynomial or diagnosis. Steudel's Nomenclator is cited as using an acceptable device because he arranged his epithets in a column under the generic name, though nowhere in his book did he explain or indicate that the two names were to be juxtaposed or combined in a particular way. What about works other than those cited? Forster's binomials published in his Characteres Generum (1776) have always been accepted, yet he printed the names in reverse order in a line of text, with the specific epithet preceding the generic name, and separated from it by a numeral, as: "Laevigata. 1. CORYNOCARPUS". There have been other typographical formulas used in publishing binomials. All would be acceptable. On the other hand, when in his Voy. Uranie Bot., the author Gaudichaud published the new monotypic genus *Australina,* he gave a Latin diagnosis and description. He ended with, "Species unica: *Urtica pusilla* (H. Desf.), &c." This treatment named a new monotypic genus, described it, then said in a sentence: The only species is the *Urtica pusilla* of Desfontaines. According to the present Art. 42 this *Australina pusilla* is illegitimate, though any sort of scattering of the generic name and the specific epithet over the page in an unexplained formula would be legitimate. It seems to me that the present rule makes legitimate any sort of dispersed typographical arrangement, while it makes illegitimate any publication in the text in which the author clearly indicates or states in words his intent to publish a new binomial or combination, gives the basonym, and often the reference, but does not actually print the specific epithet in juxtaposition immediately following the generic name. It gives undue weight to any mechanical formula of arrangement, though this is not defined, and it rejects binomials proposed and clearly stated by authors who make their intent unmistakable.

The wording of this article also leads us into the difficult maze of trinomials published during the last generation, mostly for subspecies by the followers of the American Code. See, for instance:

"*Cyrtandra kalichii* tristis (Hillebr.) Rock n. name *Cyrtandra tristis* Hillebr. ms. in C. B. Clarke, DC. Monogr. Phan. 5: 227. 1883-1887 . . . The plant in question is certainly distinct enough at least to be classed as a variety of *C. kalichii*", see Amer. Journ. Bot. 6: 64-65. 1919.

The name is printed in a trinomial formula. May we or may we not heed Rock's statement in the text that he considers the plant a variety of *C. kalichii* Wawra? There are many similar examples of names and epithets now of dubious placement due to this rule.

I propose a return to the status of this article as it was previous to 1950, by the repeal of the paragraph and the examples detailed at the head of this proposal.

Article 42 (addition)

Add the following as the fourth paragraph: "No combination is validly published if the author bases it solely upon a basonym previously published without a Latin diagnosis, subsequent to 1 Jan. 1935."

Argument: There are still some publishing taxonomists who object to the requirement of a Latin diagnosis. Under the present rules they can evade this requirement by publishing in any language their taxa in some other placement, then later publishing the new combinations under the taxa that they prefer. This provision detailed above will close a loop-hole in the law and make such acts illegal.

Article 44

In the last line: "from 1908 to 1934 inclusive with diagnoses in modern languages." Change it to read:

"from 1753 to 1934 inclusive with diagnoses in any language."

Argument: The present version implies that names published between 1753 and 1908 must have Latin diagnoses, but this is not in fact required by the International Code. The wording "modern languages" is unnecessary and it seems unwise. It might

raise the issues as to when "modern" times begin, and what current languages are not modern. In fact, up to 1934, publication in any language was legitimate, and it is better to have the law say so.

Article 48

Add at the end of the first paragraph:

"An effectively and validly published generic name is not illegitimate because of the lack of any included species.

Examples: *Cladium* P. Br., Civ. & Nat. Hist. Jamaica 114. 1756; *Thelypteris* Schmidel, Icon. Pl. ed. 2. 45. *tt. 11, 13.* 1762, see Rhodora 31: 21-26. 1929; *Margyricarpus* Ruiz & Pavon, Fl. Peruv. Prodr. 7. *pl.* 33. 1794."

Argument: By customary practice, names of genera that lack species, yet were effectively and validly published, have regularly been accepted. Nothing in the code says yea or nay about it. To resolve the issue, there should be in the code an appropriate provision, like that proposed above.

Article 54

Reject the present text and replace it by the following:

"A name of a taxon published without a clear indication of its rank is invalid."

Argument: The present Art. 54 bans such taxa for the future. It is well to have such a provision for the future, but previously published names present the same issue and difficulties. If there is no intelligible indication of the rank of a taxon, agreement as to the status of the name concerned will be impossible. Making this article retroactive will do no harm to any careful botanist of former times. As for the careless ones, their work is more or less unintelligible anyway. Their published plant names which were not placed in some stated or indicated taxon are not worthy of consideration.

New Article 54bis

"Since the symbol § has been widely used to indicate a section, any name of a taxon validly published with no other indication of rank than an associated §, is to be accepted as the name of a section.

Example: § *Diplacus* (Nutt.) Gray, Syn. Fl. N. Am. 2(1): 275. 1878, a section of the genus *Mimulus* L."

Argument: The present code does not cover this point. Many younger botanists are unfamiliar with the traditional use of the symbol §, and that it means *section.* In botany it has always been accepted as equivalent to writing out the word *section.* It is desirable to have it mentioned as acceptable under the current code.

Article 74

Delete the third paragraph which reads: "For purposes of homonymy, validly published names in all taxa must be considered."

Argument: The effective part of this provision applies to duplicate generic names and to duplicate epithets in the same taxon. They are homonyms, and the ones that were published later are made illegitimate by the first sentence of the same Art. 74. The assertion that for homonymy, validly published names in *all taxa* must be considered, is absurd. They can be homonyms only if they are in the single taxon under consideration. The word homonym is defined in Arts. 24, 65, 73, 74, and Rec. 60E. It is completely wrong to assert, for instance, that the epithet of a variety is a homonym of the name of a genus. This sentence of the code adds nothing useful to the code, and in fact is almost wholly incorrect.

It should be repealed.

Article 75

Delete the entire article.

Argument: This article authorized any botanist to reject the name of a taxon if it has been or is used with different meanings. Such a rejection conflicts with the provisions of Art. 72, "must not be rejected... because it has lost its original meaning." It conflicts with the details and the whole spirit of Art. 18 which details the type method. Art. 18 says, "A nomenclatural type (typus) is that constituent element of a taxon to which the name of the taxon is permanently attached." On the contrary, this Art. 75 empowers any botanist to reject any name that has been variously applied by botanists subsequent to the original author. If freely used this article will cause the rejection of almost all of the names published by our earlier botanists. The effect of this article is wholly bad, allowing later confusions to justify the overthrow of any name. I maintain, on the contrary, that the later confusions and misinterpretations are irrelevant. The name of any taxon that is capable of typification should rest secure upon that type and be in no way invalidated by subsequent misunderstandings by other botanists. The article should be repealed.

Article 79

At its end add the following new paragraph:

"(5) When more than 5% of the epithets are not in the Linnaean system of binary nomenclature in a book or longer article, or more than a single example in an article dealing with less than twenty species, then, all the names and epithets in the article or publication are illegitimate."

Also add as examples: "(5) Linnaeus' Species Plantarum, ed. 1, 1753, contained 6,058 species of which 101 or 1.6% had epithets of more than one word unconnected by hyphens. Many of these are legitimate under Art. 33, but others are non-binary. Miller's Gardener's Dictionary, ed. 8, 1768, contained under the letter A, 578 species, but 18 or 3% were named with polynomials. By setting a percentage of 5% for allowable polynomials, the remaining names in these basic books can be saved. In Gilibert's three books on the Flora Lithuanica (1781, 1785, 1792) there are 1,208 species, of which 90 or 13.4% are polynomial. In these books Gilibert did not consistently employ the Linnaean system of binary nomenclature."

Argument: Art. 33, and 79(4) apply to polynomial names in books largely binomial in system, but they give no maximum number of percentage of allowable deviations from the binary system. Some contemporary botanists are adopting epithets published by Gilibert and by Garsault, yet their books did not follow the Linnaean binary system. An exact or mathematical standard is needed. It should not be to rigorous, as when applied to short articles in which only a few species are published, a single non-binomial would result in a high percentage of deviation. Since the deviation by Linnaeus (1753) was 1.6% and that by Miller (1768) about 3%, it is proposed that the standard allowable deviation be set at 5%.

Article 82

Delete: Note 2 "The use of a wrong connecting vowel or vowels (or the omission of a connecting vowel) in a name or an epithet is treated as an orthographic error (see Rec. 82H)."

Delete in Art. 82, under Examples of orthographic errors: *Pereskia opuntiaeflora*, and *Cacalia napeaefolia*.

Argument: Though Rec. 82H, being only a recommendation, gives no authority to "correct" any name or epithet not using *i* to connect Latin compounds and *o* for Greek compounds, it is clear that this Note 2 of Art. 82 does grant this authority. However, it authorizes a new and a very disturbing practice. Thousands of valid and long established names will now be changed, with little, if any, gain. Fortunately, Art. 82, Note 2, conflicts with a guiding principle as stated in Art. 4, "The essential points in nomenclature are:

(1) to aim at fixity of names; (2) to avoid or to reject the use of forms and names which may cause error or ambiguity or throw science into confusion.

Next in importance is the avoidance of all useless creation of names.

Other considerations, such as absolute grammatical regularity or euphony of names, more or less prevailing custom, regard for persons, etc., notwithstanding their undeniable importance are relatively accessory."

Art. 5 also applies: "In the absence of a relevant rule, or where the consequences of rules are doubtful, established custom must be followed."

It is highly desirable that these troublesome provisions of Art. 82 be repealed.

Article 82 (note 3)

Add as final sentence:

"An author has the right to correct typographic or orthographic errors in his own earlier publications. If he vacillated in subsequent publications between several equally possible alterations, than this first one is accepted as the final correction."

"Example: *Dilphinium peregrinum* L., Sp. Pl. 531. 1753 was corrected by its author to: *Delphinium peregrinum* L., Sp. Pl. ed. 2. 749. 1762-63; and likewise in ed. 3. 749. 1764."

Argument: In general it has been the practice to allow an author to correct errors in his own publications. This is reasonable, because who but the author himself knows what he intended to publish? There is a limited provision in the present Art. 82 that typographic or orthographic errors may be corrected, but this applies equally to all. There should be a clear provision allowing the author himself to make corrections.

Article 82 (note 4)

Fourth paragraph, delete the examples and discussion concerning *Dioscorea lecardi* and *Berberis wilsonae*.

Argument: It is stated that the form of these epithets is prescribed by Rec. 82C (b) and 82D, that they should be *lecardii* and *wilsoniae*.

It is true that Rec. 82C (b) advises how to make the genitive of an adjectival suffix added to a personal name, but this is only good advice for the future. It is not retroactive or mandatory. It has also been a common practice to form epithets from personal names treated as nouns, by putting them in the genitive. If of masculine gender ending in a consonant, this gives the word ending *-i*. This is alluded to in Rec. 33B, "Names of men . . . may be substantives in the genitive . . ." Such an example is cited in the code under Art. 42, *Andropogon martini*. It is stated in Note 4 that these recommendations prescribe the spellings *lecardi* and *wilsonae*. That is incorrect. To prescribe, means: to dictate, to lay down a set of laws, or to forbid. The meaning of prescribe is clear, but this word is out of place in a recommendation. The nature of a recommendation is stated in Art. 2, as follows: "The recommendations deal with subsidiary points, their object being to bring about greater uniformity and clearness especially in future nomenclature; names or forms contrary to a recommendation cannot on that account be rejected, but they are not examples to be followed."

Thus it is clear that nothing can be prescribed by a recommendation.

The examples *Dioscorea lecardi* and *Berberis wilsonae* and their discussion should be deleted.

Recommendation 82C (b)

Delete the last sentence, reading: "Those who follow this Recommendation may treat the termination *-i* as an orthographic error and correct it."

Argument: See my proposal on 82 Note 4, fourth paragraph, and see Art. 2 which defines a recommendation as an admonition for good future work, but not being binding or retroactive. No recommendation should be worded so as to imply that it gives authority to alter the work of previous botanists.

Recommendation 82G

In the last two lines, instead of "vernacular (or barbaric) names," read: "vernacular (or non-Latin) names of the same plant,".

Examples: For *Camassia Quamash* (Pursh) Greene (basonym, *Phalangium Quamash* Pursh, Fl. Am. Sept. 1: 226. 1814), Pursh stated that "Quamash" was its name in use by the natives of the Rocky Mountains (Indians). Its specific epithet may be capitalized. For *Cyrtandra olona* C.N. Forbes (Bishop Mus., Occas. Papers 7: 34. *pl.* 5. 1920), it was stated by Forbes that the specific epithet was chosen because of a resemblance of the leaves to those of the "olona", *Touchardia latifolia* Gaud. The name "olona" is the Hawaiian vernacular name of this very different plant in another genus and family, so, as an epithet under *Cyrtandra,* it should not be capitalized.

Argument: That a third kind of epithets should be capitalized, the vernacular names, was an addition to Rec. XLIII, voted in Amsterdam (1935). This was a logical extension of the practice. It is not too difficult to ascertain whether or not the epithet is the vernacular name of that species. It may be impossible to determine whether or not the epithet is a vernacular name of some other species. I propose that this practice be limited to the single species or plant concerned.

Recommendation 82G

Rec. 82G Reaffirm this recommendation as adopted in 1950.

Argument: The proposal to replace this Rec. 82G by an article with wording to dictate that all epithets shall begin with a small initial letter, has already been made by another botanist, and it will come up for a vote at the Paris Congress. This issue was debated at Stockholm at inordinate length. The botanists at that Congress were almost evenly divided on the question. The resulting Rec. 82G was a compromise allowing either capitalization or decapitalization of epithets. For decapitalization the principal arguments are saving of time, and the convenience. For capitalization, the arguments are based on grammar and on established custom. If we examine this side, we find that the practice started with Linnaeus. He wrote *Hieracium Gronovii* L. (Sp. Pl. 802. 1753); and there also are to be found numerous epithets that were generic names, written like *Amomum Zingiber* L., and *Amomum Zerumbet* L. These are only two of the four such appearing on page 1 of this basic book. These trvial or "specific" epithets were not adjectives in agreement with the generic name which was a noun. They were nouns used in apposition and as such were capitalized. His contemporaries and followers accepted this method. It was part and parcel of the Linnaean binary system. It was accepted and followed by Thunberg, Willdenow, Roxburgh, Roemer and Schultes, Miller, Aiton, Sprengel, Lamarck, Michaux, Pursh, Hooker, Loudon,

Sibthorp, the De Candolles, Steudel, Hemsley, Coste, Torrey, Gray, Siebold, Endlicher, Watson, Hillebrand, Rock, D. C. Eaton, Coulter and Nelson, Koorders, Bentham and Hooker f., Bentham, F. v. Mueller, Brandis, Engler and Prantl, Rydberg, C. Moore, Maiden, Ewart, Black, Index Kewensis, Index Londinensis, Boissier, Zahlbruckner, Børgesen, J. Agardh, Beddome, Matsumura, Makino, Hayata, Grisebach, Oliver, de Toni, Thellung, C. Bicknell, Hooker f., Cheeseman, Drake del Castillo, Post, Parlatore, Fiori, Briquet, Ridley, Gagnepain, Schumann and Lauterbach, Sampaio, Pulle, Nannfeldt and Du Rietz, Saccardo, Cooke, Hutchinson, C. Christensen, Exell, Robyns, Kearney and Peebles, Rehder, Peck, Standley, Sherff, Setchell, L. H. Bailey, F. M. Bailey, Nicholson, Willis, G. M. Smith, W. R. Taylor, Hegi, Adamson and Salter, Perrier de la Bathie, Marie Victorin, Tidestrom, Munz, Corner, Hultén, Skottsberg, Davis, Gleason, Fernald, and by Maire, and many others right down to the present. This list is not complete, merely a selection from the basic books readily at hand. Even if capitals for epithets should now be prescribed, our literature will always be full of them. In the Paris Code of 1867, this capitalization of epithets was required by Art. 35. In the Vienna Code of 1905, it was illustrated by example in Art. 26, and detailed in Rec. X. In our present Stockholm Code of 1950, it is recognized in Rec. 82G which allows the capitalization, but allows as a free alternative complete decapitalization. It would be nice to settle this dispute finally by a large majority, but this seems unlikely. For those botanists whose interest is in a new standardization in their own writings, the present Rec. 82G allows decapitalization. For those botanists who prefer long established scientific method, and even this detail of the Linnaean binary system, Rec. 82G allows capitalization of three kinds of epithets. The present Rec. 82G, a compromise, seems the best handling of this insignificant, but hot dispute, and should not in this respect be altered.

Recommendation 82H

From line three, eliminate the word "roughly".

Argument: This word adds no useful safeguard or explanation. It implies an off-hand or careless presentation. The provisions are not carelessly drawn, so it would be better to eliminate the word "roughly".

Recommendation 82H (d)

Second paragraph, next to last line, instead of "this spelling should normally be retained." Read: "This spelling should be retained."

Argument: The word "normally" half nullifies the admonition. Though this is only a recommendation and has no retroactive or future required application, its purpose is to admonish on good practices in the future. It had better be stated simply and positively.

Recommendation 83A

First alternative proposal. Restore this to the status of an article.

Argument: See the writer's alternative proposal that Rec. 83A, remaining as a recommendation, have its wording changed from the present mandatory to the appropriate admonitions to future workers. Its present status is anomalous, as a recommendation cannot be mandatory and retroactive. The congress should either restore it to the status of an article, or keeping it as a recommendation, revise the wording to one appropriate for a recommendation. Such wording is offered in the writer's second alternative proposal.

*

Second alternative proposal. Delete the first sentence: "The gender of generic names should be determined as follows:" and replace it by: "Future authors publishing generic names should heed the following principles and customs when determining the gender."

Rec. 83A (1). Last sentence, delete from the word *Hemerocallis* to the end of the sentence.

Rec. 83A (2). Delete the second sentence, which concerns *Andropogon.*

Rec. 83A (2). Delete the third sentence, concerning *Dendromecon,* etc., and replace it by: "Generic names formed using the Greek feminine word *mecon,* poppy, as the final element, should be feminine.

Rec. 83A (2). Third paragraph, delete the second sentence.

Rec. 83A (2). Fifth paragraph. Delete part of the first sentence, from "Examples of . . . to *Dipterocarpus* and all other . . ."

Delete from the second sentence the phrases: "e.g. *Callicarpa* and *Polycarpaea:*" . . . and "e.g. *Polycarpum, Ormocarpum,* and *Pisocarpium.*"

Argument: This section was an article in the Cambridge Rules (1930), but at

the Amsterdam Congress (1935) it was changed to a recommendation. The Stockholm Congress retained it as a recommendation. Its wording now is essentially the same as when it was an article or law. The sections here proposed for repeal or modification are those with wording implying mandatory and retroactive application. Though the standardization of the gender of similarly coined names would be beneficial, no recommendation has the power of law or retroactive application. It is not even binding in the future. As made clear in Art. 2, a recommendation is merely good advice to future botanists. Consequently Rec. 83A needs a recasting, as here proposed, so that its wording will be consistent with the nature of a recommendation. If these changes are not made, the alternative is to restore the provisions to the status of an article. I would have no objection to that status. From the general acceptance of it and the frequent retroactive application of it by contemporary botanists and the resultant increased uniformity, the restoration of it as an article may be the better treatment.

Appendix II (H-1)

In the last line, correct "(Art. C. 31)" to read "(Art. C. 32)".

Argument: This was an orthographic error.

Proposal no. 78

Proposal to conserve the generic name 32A **Sequoiadendron** Buchholz of the *Pinaceae*.

Nomen conserv.: (32A) Sequoiadendron Buchholz, Amer. Journ. Bot. 26: 536-538. 1939.

T: *S. giganteum* (Lindl.) Buchholz.

Nomen rej.: *Americus* Anon., Description of the Great Tree, recently felled upon the Sierra Nevada, California, now placed for public exhibition in the spacious racket court of the Union Club, No. 596 Broadway, adjoining the Metropolitan Hotel, New York, pp. 6-7, 1854 (Herald Job Printing Office, New York).

T: *A. gigantea* (Lindl.) Anon.

Argument: Already the generic name *Sequoia* Endl. is conserved against *Steinhauera*, though by Art. 68 of the International Code (Stockholm, 1950) *Steinhauera* is illegitimate and did not need to be placed in this list. For those with a wider concept of the genus, there is no problem here, as both species, *S. sempervirens* and *S. gigantea* are placed in *Sequoia*, but for those with the narrower concept that the two are generically distinct, there is still an issue. *Sequoiadendron* Buchholz was published to include only *S. gigantea*, the big tree of California, and it was effectively published, well described, and adequately contrasted. This generic name is already being used for *Sequoia gigantea* when treated as a separate genus. Unfortunately there was for the same monotypic genus an earlier generic name, *Americus*. This name was published anonymously in a catalogue of a commercial public exhibit, when a section of a trunk of the big tree was first shown in New York in 1854. The anonymous writer made no study of the tree or its botanical characters or its taxonomic placement. The tree had already been named *Wellingtonia gigantea* by the English botanist Lindley. The American showman published a copy of Lindley's article, without acknowledging it, but as he objected to having the wonderful tree of western America named after an English military hero, he altered the wording of the descriptive article and at every place where the name *Wellingtonia gigantea* occurred in Lindley's original, he replaced it by *Americus gigantea*.

The monotypic *Americus gigantea*, though anonymous, was effectively published. It contained full descriptive details. It can be traced back to the original article by Lindley and his holotype which was the basis of *Wellingtonia gigantea* Lindl. Now, it happened that *Wellingtonia* Lindl. (1853) was a later homonym of *Wellingtonia* Meisn. (1840), so the generic name published by Lindley was illegitimate, and up to 1854 when *Americus* Anon. was published, the tree lacked a generic name. There are no other available generic names besides *Sequoiadendron*. No botanist has accepted the generic name *Americus* Anon. and it is so obscure as to be almost unknown. At least one copy of the original publication still exists.

Since the single genus is monotypic and the two names are typonyms, the same degree of importance applies to their type species. *Sequoiadendron giganteum*, the largest (or next to largest) tree in the world, is famous, and now most of the existing large individuals are conserved in national parks or national monuments. It is of horticultural importance and has been of some commercial importance. The tree is noteworthy enough to deserve special legislation on its name.

Sequoiadendron Buchholz (1939).

Accepted by Rehder, A., Man. Cult. Trees N. Am. 1940; and Bibliog. Cult. Trees N. Hemisph. 1949; Bailey, L. H. & E. Z., Hortus Second 1941; Stebbins, G. L. Jr., Science 108: 95-98. *fig. 1-2.* 1948; Rickett, H. W., N. Y. Bot. Gard., Journ. 51: 15. 1950.

Americus Anon. 1854.

Accepted by no one. Not in any of the standard systems, floras, monographs, textbooks, indexes, or bibliographies.

It is felt that *Americus* is unworthy of recognition, that it should be made a nomen genericum rejiciendum, and that *Sequoiadendron* Buchholz should be made a nomen genericum conservandum.

Proposal no. 79

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name 87 **Elodea** Rich. of the Hydrocharitaceae.

Nomen conserv.: Elodea Rich. in Michx., Fl. Bor. Am. 1: 20. 1803; fide Rich., Inst. de France, Mém. 12(2): 4. (1811-12) = 1814.

T: *Elodea canadensis* Rich. in Michx.

Nomen rej.: *Elodea* Juss., Gen. Pl. 255 in obs. 1789, and ed. 2: 283. 1791, an orthographic variant of *Elodes* Adans., 1763 (Guttiferae), and attributed to Adanson by Jussieu.

Elodea Vent., Tabl. Reg. Veg. 3: 144. ann. VII = 1799, a provisional name, not accepted by Ventenat and attributed by him to Adanson. It is also an orthographic variant of *Elodes* Adans. (Guttiferae).

Argument: *Elodea* Juss. (1789) and *Elodea* Vent. (1799) have no importance themselves as they were but orthographic variants of *Elodes* Adans. (1763), a genus in the Guttiferae segregated by Adanson from *Hypericum.* Neither Jussieu nor Ventenat claimed that their name *Elodea* was new, on the contrary they both attributed it fully to Adanson. However, in both instances, the name *Elodea* was effectively published. When the segregate genus is accepted as distinct from *Hypericum,* it is correctly called *Elodes* Adans., the original and correct form of this name. The altered versions *Elodea* of Jussieu and of Ventenat have no acceptance in modern nomenclature. The version *Helodea* is not discussed here because it is disposed of by Art. 82.

Now for *Elodea* Rich. in Michx. (1803), published as a monotypic genus with the sole species *Elodea canadensis* from eastern Canada. Another species was incidentally mentioned but it was not described or validly published. Hence, *Elodea* started as a monotypic genus. This genus has always been accepted by subsequent botanists as distinct, though there are differences of taxonomic opinion as to the number of species and the need for removing segregate genera. These taxonomic opinions are not pertinent to the issue of the nomenclature of *Elodea* Rich. in Michx.

There are about ten species accepted in the genus *Elodea,* and the genus occurs as a native from Canada to the southwestern United States, and from Colombia to Argentina. Although a few other species have now spread to other countries, the spectacular spread has been by *E. canadensis* which has escaped from cultivation, is now growing wild on all the continents, and in many countries is a conspicuous part of the flora.

The treatment of *Elodea* in floristic works and in monographs has been diverse. Later generic synonyms of *Elodea* in either the broad sense or in a restricted segregate sense are: *Anacharis* Rich. (1814), *Udora* Nutt. (1818), *Philotria* Raf. (1818), *Diplandra* Bert. (1830), *Apalanthe* Planch. (1848), and *Egeria* Planch. (1849). The only one of these to have much usage is *Anacharis.* This was described from European material. Later it was demonstrated to be the identical species and genus earlier described as *Elodea canadensis* Rich. in Michx. The only recent revision of the group was by Fr. Marie-Victorin (Univ. Montréal, Lab. Bot., Contr. 18: 1931). From living topotype material he gave an excellent account of *E. canadensis,* but could not confirm one detail in the original description by Richard in Michaux, that the flowers had three stamens with cordate anthers. Except for this one disputed detail, the original description of *E. canadensis* with its fugitive, very minute flowers, was full and accurate. Because of this "error" Marie-Victorin rejected *Elodea,* and in its place adopted *Anacharis* Rich., though inconsistently he maintained the species *canadensis* of the original monotypic genus. Marie-Victorin closed with a synopsis of the species of *Anacharis* and *Philotria* but this was merely a bibliographic revision, not one based upon taxonomic study of all the species and not even including a consultation of the original descriptions of or correct references to all the species. Nevertheless, being the last revision of the group, the classification proposed by Marie-Victorin has been followed by numerous recent writers. But, in

the basic works by Bentham & Hooker, Engler & Prantl, Dalla Torre & Harms, Rendle, and Hutchinson, *Elodea* is accepted.

The economic importance of this small hydrophyte is considerable. In slow streams and canals of lowland countries with partly calcareous waters, as in western Europe, it has for about a century been very abundant and at times by blocking the waterways has been a major economic factor. It is used for growing in pools and aquaria commonly throughout the world and as *Elodea* is known to great numbers of people, scientific or common.

Its morphological and physiological importance is considerable. There is scarcely a botanical laboratory in the world that does not keep it in cultivation. It has been constantly used for instruction and demonstration of cell structure, living protoplasm, respiration, photosynthesis, and other physiological processes. Almost all botanical students see and study the plant. Almost all elementary texts of botany for the last 150 years have discussed and often illustrated it. In these texts it is still regularly called *Eiodea.*

Illustrations of this species, as cited in the Index Londinensis, include ten under the name *Anacharis Alsinastrum,* all published in Europe between 1848 and 1873. Since Marie-Victorin's revision in 1931, there have been cited four illustrations under the name *Anacharis canadensis.* For other species, when placed in *Anacharis* there have been five illustrations.

For *Elodea canadensis* there are cited thirty six illustrations, and for the other species in this genus twenty illustrations.

Because *Elodea* Rich. in Michx. (Hydrocharitaceae) is of economic, ornamental, biologic, experimental, and educational value, and since the name *Elodea* has had a great preponderance of usage in both hemispheres for the last hundred years, it is strongly recommended for conservation. An extensive list of literature has been submitted to the Rapporteur-Général.

B. Proposals by Maxwell S. Doty (Honolulu)

Proposal no. 80

In view of the forthcoming Congress, it has been thought wise to make the following formal proposals. These are made with the hope that their adoption would serve to clarify certain Articles and strengthen the application of the Principles of the Code.

Article 9

It is proposed that the following be added as a note:

"Nomenclature is considered to be distinct from other phases of systematic botany and this Code is a guide just to nomenclatural procedure. The Code and nomenclature itself are not intended or expected to affect taxonomy (the circumscription of taxa) *or phyletic arrangements."*

Article 10

A name used in one way may be legitimate or if used otherwise illegitimate depending whether or not the name is used in accordance with the Rules. A name cannot of itself be in accordance or contrary to the Rules.

Emend paragraph one to read: "A legitimate name or epithet is one that is *being used* in accordance with the rules."

Emend paragraph two to read: "An illegitimate name or epithet is one that is *being used* contrary to the rules."

Article 11

It is suggested that the exceptions to Article 11 be listed here or that a reference to them be added.

Article 16

It is to be noted here that only a *single* specific epithet (Article 33) can be used with a generic name in binomial nomenclature.

Emend in second paragraph to read *"...legitimate name validly..."* and the third paragraph excluding *"...*or epithets*..."* to read *"...legitimate epithet validly published with the same rank."*

Add a note referring to Article 26.

Article 20

Add to the note *"see Article 26".*

Article 29

In lines four and three of the "note" change the word "authority", to *"author".* Make same change in lines two and four of the "example".

Article 32

This article could well be modified to make it clear that description of a subgeneric taxon not including the type of the genus automatically creates a second subgeneric taxon of equal rank, typified by the type of the generic taxon.

It is proposed that there be added a sentence to read: *"Valid publication of a name for any subordinated taxon which does not include the nomenclatural type of the higher taxon automatically creates a subordinated taxon of the same rank which has as its nomenclatural type the type of the genus and which bears the generic name unaltered."*

Recommendation 33C

It is proposed as a guide that a paragraph *"j"* be added to read *"The Latin ending is preferably added directly to a word taken from languages other than Latin or Greek with no alteration of the word. Example:* Cyrtandra waianaeensis *St. John* (1950. Occas. Papers B. P. Bishop Mus. 20: 80) *for a* Cyrtandra *from the Waianae Mountains."*

Article 42

The third paragraph should be placed (transposed) between paragraphs one and two for clarity in reference to the application of the date, January 1, 1953.

Because of uncertainties previous to certain dates, we have accepted (Art. 23) starting dates for nomenclature. Furthermore, merely by referring to a name previously published in frank contradiction of Article 44 the name thereby, as the article stands now, becomes validly published. This is certainly a circumvention of the intent of the Code and can be expected to lead to difficulties both in citation and indexing. To avoid these situations it is proposed that the first paragraph be altered to read "...or by a reference to a previously *validly* published description of it."

The author is well aware that this proposal and that for Article 48, below, involve a certain principle. This principle is essentially whether, arbitrarily to be sure, applications of names to taxa are only applicable as taxa were recognized after the starting points. The present author believes we should not try to name pre-starting point taxa, but publish a description if we wish to use a taxon that was also recognized in pre-starting times. Furthermore, if a name is validly published only by reference to pre-starting point literature, then the type for the name is indicated in, or is itself, the pre-starting point literature. If, as rarely is the case, material is designated in the pre-starting point description there is almost no likelihood of its being available for examination.

The present suggestion for modification of such Articles as 42, 48, 52, etc. would eliminate these vagueness of name application especially in the future.

Article 48

To prevent circumvention of Article 44, and in line with Article 42 as suggested above, with the attendent confusion in reference to priority, correct citation of authors, and indexing, and in line with the principles of the Code it is proposed that the second and third lines be made to read "...(2) *by citation of a previously and* validly *published description of* the genus, or (3) *by reference to a previously and* validly *published description...*"

Article 52

To prevent further unclearness in application of names, as discussed under Article 42 above, it is proposed here that the second clause of Article 51 numbered "(1)" be modified to read *"...of a previously and* validly *published description..."*

Article 52

The application of a name under a taxonomy and classification different from that of the original author cannot be ascertained without a type. Thus, it is recommended that as a paragraph of Article 52 the following be added to the Code as a rule:

"After January 1, 1955, names for taxa are not validly published unless the type is designated."

Article 57

It is proposed that for clarity the following be added as a paragraph:

"This does not apply to specific epithets, which cannot be used other than as their application is determined by their type, whether it be a holotype or lectotype."

Article 57

It is proposed that the last two words "...as authority" be deleted from the rule as it now stands. A major purpose of the Code is to determine the correct name on the basis of priority and application rather than *"authority"*.

Recommendation 60F

Though the present author is unaware of any discussion or presentation of this Recommendation at the Stockholm Congress it may be wise to expand it as a guide. It is proposed that the examples be expanded to include the following brief paragraph of examples from different fields:

"The first 4 vols. of Index Kewensis accepted usage as publication of names. This is what Doty (Farlowia 3: 176) *did in publishing as a synonym combination and authors* 'Sarcophyllis californica S. & G. (non J. Agardh)' *and what Papenfuss* (Madrono 9: 14) *did in publishing* "Plumaria *Schmitz.*"

Article 61

This article says essentially that one may have to alter names if a different taxonomic concept is accepted; otherwise the correct name is permanent. This is the guide to implementation of the principle set forth as one of the essential goals of the nomenclatural Code expressed in Article 4, "to aim at fixity of names."

It is suggested that an alteration of the circumscription of a taxon in such a way that some entities become newly excluded or included might well newly exclude or include types. This could necessitate alteration of the name (Art. 18). Thus it is proposed that to the first sentence of Article 61 there be added "(4) *by resulting inclusion or exclusion of types.*"

Article 75

The application of names (Art. 18) is determined by the type method. The meaning of a name need not be (Art. 72) considered. A name cannot be applied to a group which is so delimited as to exclude the type of the name (Art. 57) unless a Botanical Congress votes to conserve the name in the perverted application. This does not, of course, apply to species.

It is proposed that Article 75 be emended to read: *"A name of a taxon must be rejected if it is used contrary to its application as indicated by the type method."*

A wise alternative may be to eliminate this Article entirely for it is covered by Articles 30, 72 & 61. See proposal above in reference to Article 61.

The Code applies to the choosing of the correct name among those legitimate names which are applicable in a given case. The "given case" is a taxon of a given circumscription. The Code does not apply to taxon formation (taxonomy): The Code only operates after the taxonomic distinctions are drawn. Thus, a name cannot be founded on characters. It is founded (Art. 16) on valid publication.

It is suggested that the Article should be altered to read: *"A name must be rejected if its type is composed of two or more entirely discordant elements, unless it is possible to select one of these elements as a satisfactory type."*

This portion of the article is essentially related to the second paragraph of Article 21. It would appear that the Article, being one concerned primarily with typification, should be moved in position to follow that Article, if it is to be retained.

Article 77

The Article verges on taxonomy and has little place in a code of nomenclature. Articles 4, 9, 18 (note 1), etc., clearly state the Principles of the Code to be non taxonomic and that the type need not be a representative typical of the taxon. Actually if the organism can be placed taxonomically it can serve perfectly as a type. Furthermore, whether some specimen represents a monstrosity or not is a matter of opinion and cannot be expected to be consistently recognized by different workers.

It is proposed that this Article be deleted from the Code.

C. Proposals by Hawaiian Botanists

Proposal no. 81

Article 9

Delete the words: "not to indicate its characters or history, but —"

As amended it will read, "The purpose of giving a name to a taxon is to supply a means of referring to it."

Argument: This Art. 9 is new, not appearing in any previous International Code. From the beginning of nomenclature, names have been given to the genera and species and other taxa of plants that indicate their characteristic appearance, difference, use, value, history, or association with some distinguished botanist. It is still legal to coin and to publish such names, and it is a common and good practice. In other parts of the Code, viz. in Rec. 30A, 33A, 33C, 37A, 82B, 82C, 82D, 82E, and 82G, instructions are given how to form just such names and

epithets, indicating characteristics, history, personal association or dedication, etc.

The phrase to be eliminated from Art. 9 seems to forbid the publishing or using of names or epithets that indicate taxonomic characteristics or history. This prohibition is not accepted or applied, and it conflicts with Art. 30 which says that the name of a genus "may be taken from any source whatever, and may even be composed in an absolutely arbitrary manner."

Art. 9 assumes a single purpose in the minds of all publishing botanists, merely to supply a name. It is improbable that the framers of the Code can know the mental intent and purpose in the minds of all publishing botanists, or that it is always a single purpose. Certainly the purpose is often present to publish a name of a taxon that gives its outstanding characteristics, or to allude to its history. In these matters the wording of Art. 9 seems incorrect. The essential principle which it tries to express is merely that: a name is a name. By the elimination of the phrase, as here proposed, the meaning of the article will be just that, and its conflicts with other articles and recommendations will be eliminated.

Proposed by Harold St. John and W. J. Newhouse, University of Hawaii.

Proposal no. 82

Article 33

In the first paragraph to bring the third sentence and the second sentence into agreement it is proposed that the third sentence be amended to terminate with the words "... must be hyphened or united."

Proposed by: Howard A. Woolford, University of Hawaii.

Proposal no. 83

Article 33

As a second paragraph it is here proposed that there be added: "Specific epithets consisting of more than one word are to be rejected if published after 1955".

Proposed by: Martha Hannam Bell, University of Hawaii.

Proposal no. 84

Article 52

The application of a name under a taxonomy and classification different from that of the original author cannot be ascertained without a type. Thus it is recommended that as a paragraph of Article 52 the following be added to the code as a rule:

"On and after 1 Jan. 1955, names for taxa are not validly published unless the type is designated."

Proposed by: Charles H. Lamoureux, University of Hawaii.

Proposal no. 85

Recommendation 54A

It is recommended that Recommendation 54A be reworded as a paragraph to read:

"The name of a new taxon should not be published without indicating the place where the type is preserved."

Proposed by: Charles H. Lamoureux, University of Hawaii.

Proposal no. 86

Article 73 (8)

To read: "Binary names for subdivisions of genera or larger taxa are illegitimate".

Examples: The following are illegitimate: *Alchemilla vulgaris* agg. (L.) Clapham, Tutin & Warburg, Fl. Brit. Is. 505. 1952, an aggregate including eleven species; *Gigantabies taxifolia* J. Nelson (as Senilis), Pinaceae 78-79. 1866, a specific epithet combined with the name of a subdivision.

Argument: The use of binary nomenclature for taxa subordinate to species is illegitimate by Art. 34. A similar prohibition, like that here proposed, is needed to eliminate binomials published for taxa higher than species.

Proposed by: Alastair R. H. Lamberton, University of Hawaii.

D. La Société Mycologique de France

Proposition n. 87

Recommandations 82B & C

Recommandation sur l'orthographe des noms et épithètes *(à incorporer au* texte des Recommandations 82B & C; version complète de la proposition publiée dans Taxon 2: 194):

"Eviter de donner aux noms de genres et d'espèces une apparence qui contredise trop gravement l'orthographe et la phonétique du latin (rencontres inusitées de consonnes et surtout de voyelles). Lorsque, en application de cette recommandation, un nom propre se sera trouvé trop modifié, il devra être transcrit sans modification à la fin de la diag-

nose avec la mention: dédié à UN TEL.

Lorsque le terme spécifique aura une terminaison identique à celles des principaux types latins (*us, a, is,* etc.), il sera décliné selon les normes de cette langue. Ex.: Magnus deviendra "Magni" et non "Magnusi".

Il sera également bon de supprimer dans les noms de genres et d'espèces les éléments morphologiques inconnus du latin. Ex.: Urvillea et non d'Urvillea, Clusii et non de l'Eclusei."

Recommandation 82G

Supprimer la Recommandation.

Appendix V B (section VII, Fungi)

TYPIFICATION.

Genre **Marasmius**: la désignation de *M. rotula* Bull. ex Fries n'a rien en soi qui puisse choquer, mais elle offre l'inconvénient pratique suivant:

Patouillard a détaché des *Marasmius* un genre *Androsaceus* avec précisément *M. rotula* comme type. Si l'on a met ce taxon comme genre, on sera obligé de lui donner le nom de *Marasmius* et l'on manquera d'un nom bien connu pour désigner le reste.

Or, il est admis dans les principes généraux de la typification, dans des cas semblables, de choisir le type parmi les espèces qui n'ont jamais changé de genre et pour lesquelles aucune coupure générique n'a été proposée.

Il nous semble donc plus prudent, pour ménager l'avenir, de choisir comme type de *Marasmius* une espèce ne faisant pas partie des *Androsaceus* de Patouillard, par exemple *ramealis* ou *Oreades.*

Genre COLLYBIA: il y aurait un grand inconvénient à adopter la proposition de MM. Singer et E. H. Smith de choisir *C. dryophila* comme type de ce genre, car les systématiciens d'aujourd'hui sont à peu près d'accord avec Karsten pour admettre que *Marasmius urens* et *Collybia dryophila* sont „congénériques". Il y a donc un grand risque, dans l'avenir, de voir disparaître le nom de *Collybia,* comme synonyme de *Marasmius,* ce qui serait regrettable.

La désignation de *Collybia fusipes* Bull. ex Fr. paraît très préférable.

Genre ou sous-genre ENTOLOMA: il semblerait naturel au premier abord de choisir comme type *E. lividum* Bull. ex Fr. Cependant des recherches récentes m'ont permis de penser que cette espèce appartient au même groupe que l'*E. rhodopolium* Bull. ex Fr. Or deux coupures subgénériques ont été proposées récemment pour cette dernière espèce et ses voisines. Elles risqueraient dans l'avenir de devenir synonymes d'*Entoloma* et de disparaître ainsi de la nomenclature, alors qu'on se trouverait sans nom pour le reste du groupe.

C'est pourquoi il serait plus prudent de désigner comme type du genre l'autre espèce que Fries regardait comme un Entolome "genuinum" c'est-à-dire *E. prunuloides* Bull. ex Fr.

Un type nouveau de conservation

Les Règles actuelles ont été créées spécialement pour la Phanérogamie, à une époque où les grandes lignes de la classification et la délimitation des genres étaient, pour cette partie de la Botanique, parfaitement assises.

La science mycologique a un grand retard à cet égard sur la Phanérogamie et sa systématique est encore en pleine gestation. L'application stricte des Règles y crée des étrangetés qui heurtent souvent le bon sens. En particulier actuellement il existe deux écoles de sytématiciens: les uns, imitant les Phanérogamistes, multiplient les genres; les autres préfèrent en réduire ou du moins n'en augmenter le nombre que le plus discrètement possible. Il en résulte qu'actuellement on est amené, si l'on applique les Règles, à une situation très confuse, un même terme étant utilisé par les uns dans son sens large, par les autres dans un sens restreint. Ainsi, lorsqu'une espèce est actuellement décrite comme *Entoloma* ou *Psathyrella,* il est impossible de savoir à quel taxon elle appartient au juste, ce qui complique les recherches bibliographiques et engendre la confusion.

Cet inconvénient est mille fois plus grave qui celui — tout à fait nul en pratique — qui découle des homonymes, sévèrement pourchassés au nom des Règles, entre genres appartenant à des ensembles aussi éloignés que les Phanérogames et les Champignons par exemple. C'est pour le pallier que MM. Singer et A. H. Smith, ainsi que la Société Mycologique de France, avaient demandé la conservation de *Rhodophyllus* Quélet pour englober les *Entoloma, Leptonia, Nolanea, Eccilia* et *Claudopus* de Fries conservés en tant que sous-genres. Or il semble bien que la portée et les conséquences exactes de cette proposition n'aient pas été toujours comprises. Dans le type usuel de conservation, l'un des deux noms en cause disparaît au bénéfice de l'autre; or il ne saurait être question d'éliminer de la nomenclature un nom aussi

connu, aussi ancien et aussi utile qu'*Entoloma* par exemple. Il ne s'agit que d'une *conservation conditionnelle et temporaire,* un simple *sursis à la stricte application* des Régles, justifié par la situation *de fait* qui règne dans la taxonomie des champignons. Il serait vain en effet de vouloir à tout prix stabiliser la nomenclature, avant que la taxonomie ait au moins commencé à donner l'exemple.

Aussi s'agit-il seulement d'autoriser temporairement l'utilisation du terme ancien et très connu de *Rhodophyllus* (utilisé dans un grand nombre d'ouvrages floristiques de base comme il y est fait allusion dans l'Article 21: *Flore Mycologique* de Quelet, *Flora Agaricina Danica* de Lange, les *Agaricales* de Singer, la *Kleine Kryptogamenflora von Mitteleuropa* d'Helmut Gams et Moser, la *Flore Analytique des Champignons supérieurs* de Kühner et Romagnesi, etc.), lorsque l'on fusionne en un genre unique des taxons (créés d'ailleurs comme sous-genres et non comme genres par Fries) que nous avons cités ci-dessus. Lorsque ceux-ci sont regardés comme genres, il est bien clair que le terme de *Rhodophyllus,* devenu inutile, doit disparaître.

Les choses pourront rentrer dans l'ordre et les règles s'appliquer strictement le jour où, dans un sens ou dans l'autre, les systématiciens se seront prononcés sur la question de leur fusion. Une décision du Comité compétent entérinerait cet accord.

Naturellement une telle exception ne saurait engager l'avenir, et, dans notre esprit, ne saurait s'appliquer que si des noms convenables ont été proposés avant la *mise en vigueur des Règles,* c'est-à-dire avant 1910.

Si l'on en craignait les effets malheureux dans quelque autre partie de la Botanique, il serait facile de la limiter strictement aux Champignons. Ou mieux, pour que cette limitation la réduise en fait au seul cas des Champignons dits supérieurs, il suffirait de préciser qu'elle ne trouverait son application que dans le cas où les taxa fusionnés n'ont pas été dotés du rang de genres par leur créateur.

Nous proposons donc de prévoir l'exception suivante pour l'article des Règles visant les fusions de genres:

„Toutefois, à titre provisoire, on n'appliquera pas la Règle lors de la fusion de taxa non dotés du rang de genre par leur créateur, lorsque un nom convenable, englobant tous ces taxa, aura été créé avant 1910 et tant que le Comité compétent n'aura pas pris la décision contraire".

E. Proposals by C. V. Morton (Washington D.C.)

Proposal no. 88

A proposal to *remove* the name **Nothoscordum** from the list of Nomina Conservanda.

The genus *Nothoscordum* Kunth (Enum. 4: 457. 1843) of the Liliaceae was placed on the list of *nomina conservanda* by the International Botanical Congress in Brussels in 1910, and has remained on the list unchanged ever since. There are three names listed as *nomina rejicienda,* namely *Geboscon* Raf., *Periloba* Raf., and *Pseudoscordum* Herbert. A study of these three rejected names shows that none of them are eligible to replace *Nothoscordum* according to the new International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

Geboscon Raf. This name is cited in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature as "Cat. 14. 1824". The full citation is: First Cat. Bot. Gard. Transylv. Univ. 14. 1824. Dr Elmer D. Merrill has made a special study of the works of Rafinesque, and he states (Merrill, Index Rafinesquianus 90. 1949) that in this Catalogue by Rafinesque the genus *Geboscon* is a *nomen nudum.* It is therefore not validly published in 1824.

The next use of the name *Geboscon* is by Rafinesque in the rare work Herbarium Rafinesquianum [Atlantic Journal, extra number of no. 6], page 65. 1833. Miss L. Schwarten, Librarian of the Arnold Arboretum, has kindly made a transcript of this publication for me. The entire entry in which the name *Geboscon* occurs is as follows:

"158. *Allium stenium,* Raf. Acaule, fol. filif. planiusculis obtusis scapo breviorib. scapo tereto, umbella paucifl. fl. erectis, stam. inclusis — Illinois, vernal, pedal, flowers white."

"Remarks: there is the greatest confusion about many of our sp. of this G. because blended; the real Southern plant is very distinct from these 3 Western, and its original name ought to be restored."

"*Allium ornithogaloides,* Walter. Acaule, fol. linearib. canalicul. dorso striatis, scapo compresso, spatha bivalv. ovatis acutis, umbella pauciflora. Carolina, this is *A. striatum.* El. *A. inodorum,* Wild. etc. *A. fragrans* of

some, and even the *A. Canadense* of Mx. not L. They all belong to the S.G. *Geboscon* with capsule terete few seeded."

Rafinesque used "G" for genus, and "S.G." for subgenus. Therefore his use of the name at this place is as a subgenus only, and it thus has no effect on the nomenclature of *Nothoscordum* as a genus.

The first valid publication of *Geboscon* Raf. as a genus is in Rafinesque, Flora Telluriana (2: 19. 1836 [1837]). The full treatment is as follows:

"36. Geboscon R. (nom. grec.) Diff. 33. Petalis erectis concavis, alterni latiora. Filamentis filiformis longissimis. Caps. globosa 6 sp. — *G. obliquum*. Allium Gm. Sib-t-9. Lin et Auctoris."

The genus 33 referred to by Rafinesque in the description is *Aglitheis* (Fl. Tell. 2: 17). Rafinesque makes no mention of any previous use by himself of the name *Geboscon*. This is an entirely new and independent publication. The description of the capsule as "6 sp.", i.e. 6-seeded, shows that Rafinesque was dealing with an *Allium* rather than a *Nothoscordum*, for one of the principal (and almost only definite) features of *Nothoscordum* is the fact that the capsule is many-seeded (i.e. more than 2 ovules in each cell of the pistil). The only species mentioned must, of course, be the type of the genus, and that is *Geboscon obliquum*, a combination based on *Allium obliquum* L. (and *A. obliquum* of Gmelin and Sibthorp), which is a true species of *Allium* (or at least not a *Nothoscordum*), a native of eastern Europe and central Asia.

Therefore, the genus *Geboscon* Raf. must take its place as a synonym of *Allium*, and be removed from the nomina rejicienda under *Nothoscordum*.

Periloba Raf. is cited in the International Code as "Fl. Tell. 4: 87. 1836". Rafinesques treatment is:

"1063. Periloba R. diff. Nolana, cal. carinatis 3 vel 5angul. non sagitt. cor. camp. 5loba, libis trilobatis, disco 5lobo, caps. monosp. — Type *P. paradoxa* R. Nol. do Lind. b. reg. 895, b. mag. 2603. prostrata fol. pet. ovatis obt. Chili, fl. blue."

Obviously, this has nothing to do with *Nothoscordum*, and it is incomprehensible how it could have ever been cited as a synonym of that genus. It is not a monocotyledon at all, but is a valid genus of the family Nolanaceae. These facts were pointed out by Dr I. M. Johnston in 1929 (Flora of Northern Chile. Contr. Gray Herb. 85: 104-105. 1929), but the name has remained still as a *nomen rejiciendum* under *Nothoscordum*.

Pseudoscordum is cited in the International Code as "Herb. Amaryll. 11. 1837". The treatment of Herbert at the place indicated is as follows:

„To illustrate this I may state, that there are plants amongst Amaryllideae, which but for the difference of having the perianth and stamens superior instead of inferior to the ovary, would be almost identical with others amongst Asphodeleae; for instance, if the scentless Alliums of the latter (an occidental race forming, I believe, a separate genus, which might be called Pseudoscordum), had the ovary inferior, it would require nice discrimination to separate them from Lapiedra of the former . ."

Pseudoscordum is surely a *nomen provisorium* not definitely accepted by Herbert and is thus invalid; it is also a *nomen sub nudum*, no character being given except that of being scentless. It may not thus invalidate the later genus *Nothoscordum*.

It has been shown above that two of the names cited under *Nothoscordum* are not synonyms of *Nothoscordum* at all, one *Geboscon* being a synonym of *Allium*, and one, *Periloba*, a valid genus of Nolanaceae, and the third, *Pseudoscordum* an invalid name. Therefore, *Nothoscordum* is a correct name and does not need conservation; it should be removed from the list of nomina conservanda.

Proposal no. 89

The following amendment to **Article 24** of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1952) is proposed for consideration at the next International Botanical Congress.

Present Reading: However, in order to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of genera, families, orders, and intermediate taxa entailed by the strict application of the rules, and especially of the principle of priority in starting from the dates given in Art. 23, this Code provides lists of names which must be retained as exceptions. These names are preferably such as have come into general use in the fifty years following their publication, or which have been used in monographs and important floristic works up to the year 1890.

Proposed Amendment: For "up to the year 1890" substitute "up to the year 1907."

Argument: A number of botanists in

proposing certain names for conservation have cited particularly recent monographs and floristic works and have overlooked the fact that the intent of the rule as stated above is to preserve nineteenth century usage up to the year 1890. This is not a new rule, but has been in the code continuously since the Vienna Congress in 1905. At the time of the Vienna Congress Otto Kuntze was the subject of violent controversy. The arbitrary date 1890 was doubtless set to discourage consideration of the usage of Kuntze's Revisio Generum Plantarum (1891). The retention of nineteenth century usage is still a valid objective, but the date 1890 is not appropriate.

Nineteenth century usage culminated in two major works, which have been supplemented but nut superseded, — the Index Kewensis, completed in 1895, and Engler and Prantl, Die Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien, which appeared over a period of years around the turn of the century. Index Kewensis deals, of course, only with Phanerogamae; usage for Phanerogamae in Engler and Prantl is codified in Dalla Torre and Harms, Genera Siphonogamarum, completed in 1907. Therefore, the date 1907 is appropriate for Phanerogamae.

It is a peculiar coincidence that the date 1907 is also appropriate for a number of other groups. Christensen's Index Filicum was completed in 1906, De Toni, Sylloge Algarum was published 1889—1905, the original Saccardo, Sylloge Fungorum and the first Supplementum Universale 1882—1906; E. G. Paris, Index Bryologicus appeared in 1894. The other cryptogamic groups were treated in Engler and Prantl, ending up with Schiffner's treatment of Hepaticae in 1909.

It seems therefore that there is ample justification for replacing the meaningless date 1890 with 1907, which is more appropriate for more groups. The insertion of any particular date in the Code does not prohibit consideration of usage subsequent to the date; it merely indicates where the primary emphasis should be.

F. Various Proposals

Proposal no. 90

Proposal to add the following sentence either as a second paragraph to Art. 80, as a special case (8) at the end of Art. 73 under Sect. 13, or to insert it in Sect. 8 as a **new article** following **Art. 63**.

"When a species is divided into two or more subdivisions each with a definite geographic area, infraspecific names such as *albiflorus, variegatus, nanus* and *terrestris* based on slight or unessential modifications which may recur anywhere within the area of that species, may be rejected if the definition of the infraspecific taxon is totally remodelled, even if the rank of the taxon is indicated by the same name".

Example: When the infraspecific taxon of *Prunella vulgaris* L. occurring in East Asia is considered a geographic variety, the combination var. *asiatica* (Nakai) based on *P. asiatica* Nakai is legitimate, although there are several earlier varietal names from Japan such as var. *lilacina* Nakai, var. *albiflora* Koidzumi, and var. *ovalifolia* Nakai, all of which based on very slight modifications observed in this infraspecific taxon but occurring also in the European and N. American infraspecific taxa of *P. vulgaris*. These names are to be rejected because the original descriptions contain no indications that would enable us to identify the East-Asiatic geographic taxon, and because *P. asiatica* Nakai is the earliest adequate name for the latter.

Discussion: *Prunella vulgaris* var. *lilacina* Nakai (1911) and var. *albiflora* Koidzumi (1915) were originally described as colour variants found in Japan. At that time the common Japanese plant was considered identical with the typical *P. vulgaris* of Europe. Later it became clear that there is an East-Asiatic taxon that differs from the European one in its robust habit, its more elongate and hairy leaves, its larger flowers, and its sharper pointed calyx-lobes. When this East-Asiatic taxon is regarded as a geographic variety of *P. vulgaris*, the earliest varietal epithet *lilacina* based on a Japanese plant would under the present Code have to be adopted for it although its diagnostic characters are entirely different and its definition is totally remodelled.

The original discription of var. *lilacina* merely states that the plant has lilac flowers, and contains no indications that would enable us to identify the East-Asiatic taxon to which it belongs. Moreover the adoption of the name var. *lilacina* for the East-Asiatic plants, would lead to confusion because most botanists would think that the East-Asiatic race possesses lilac flowers. Thus the use of var. *lilacina* in a new delimitation

would always require an explanation, and this apparently clashes with one of the essential points mentioned in Art. 4 viz. (2), which reads "to avoid or reject the use of names which may cause error or ambiguity". Moreover, the common form, which possesses deep violet flowers, would have to bear such a lengthy name as *P. vulgaris* var. *lilacina* f. *asiatica*. For these reasons the combination *P. vulgaris* var. *asiatica* based on *P. asiatica* Nakai (1930), a name that was clearly intended for the East-Asiatic taxon, is the most appropriate one, and the epithet *lilacina* should be restricted to the lilac-coloured form of the East-Asiatic taxon, which should be called var. *asiatica* f. *lilacina*.

The above example is not very complicated. Consider a more variable species which includes numerous modifications or of which many horticultural forms have been described which in former days were usually published under varietal names. Recently *Torilis japonica* (Houtt.) DC. was adopted as the correct name for a widespread species including the European *T. Anthriscus* Gmelin (non Gaertn). However, the Japanese plant differs from the common European one in its deeply divided leaves with long caudate lobes, and this is apparently a taxon that ought to be designated as a geographic variety of *T. japonica* s.l. Who could possibly answer the question what the legitimate infraspecific epithet of the European taxon is? No catalogues of the type of the Index Kewensis are available in which the infraspecific names are included. An exhaustive search would have to be made for all possible competing names of infraspecific rank. Even after painstaking study, the application of some varietal names, whose type specimens are non-extant or which have been based on cultivated plants, may remain doubtful. To dig up ancient infraspecific epithets, some of which may have been based on irrelevant characters or on horticultural normalities, to take great trouble in locating and examining their type specimens, and to spend a good deal of time in fixing the name of geographic varieties, is asking too much of the taxonomists; and taxonomists of the present day and of the future should not be burthened with this task. The detailed analysis of local populations within a species has recently become actual and attempts are now made to define geographic taxa, especially in widespread and polymorphic species, by means of morphological as well as cytological and ecological characters. However, the naming of geographic taxa offers under the present Code so many difficulties that it is hindering instead of promoting the progress of taxonomy. The first aim of the Code, viz. to fix the scientific plant names, is in these cases hard to attain.

It is true that the Code should be as simple as possible, but considering the numerous difficulties that the nomenclature of infraspecific taxa and especially the fixing of the names of the geographic ones offer, exceptions to the strict application of priority should be admitted, and we should follow here the same line of conduct as in the case of the "nomina generica conservanda". Some taxonomists may fear that the practical application of this proposal will become a source of dissension, but the application of this proposal is limited to infraspecific taxa, and the danger is here, in my opinion much smaller than in the application of Art. 73 (1) (superfluous names), Art. 75 (confused or ambiguous names), Art. 76 (mixtures of discordant elements), and Art. 77 (monstrosity).

The adoption of this proposal will, I hope, contribute to stabilize the names of geographic taxa, and to avoid frequent changes in their names by digging out earlier but neglected infraspecific epithets. Another alternative would be that the Congress introduces a new article stating that the rank of the geographic taxon is distinct from that of all other infraspecific taxa (it might be called e.g. geosubsp. or geovar.).

Proposed by: H. Hara, Tokyo.

Proposal no. 91

Proposal to substitute the term "basonym" by "basionym". (Original publication: Taxon 1: 110).

Proposed by: J. Paclt, Bratislava.

Proposal no. 92

Proposal to substitute the term "binary name" by "specific name". (Original publication: Taxon 1: 118). — Other sources: F. POCHE, „Was verstehen die Internationalen Nomenklaturregeln unter binärer Nomenklatur?", Entomol. Zschr. 41: 81-84, 129-134, 199-210, 223-231, 233-244. 1927.

Proposed by: J. Paclt, Bratislava.

Proposal no. 93

Proposal to substitute the term "ternary name" by "infraspecific name".

Arguments: The arguments are similar to those given for the proposed change of the term "binary name" — Taxon 1: 118.

Proposed by: J. Paclt, Bratislava.

Proposal no. 94

Proposal to conserve the generic name **Dunalia** H.B.K. of the Solanaceae.

Dunalia H.B.K. Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. 3: 55. *t. 194.* 1818, nom. conserv. prop. (Solanaceae).

Type sp.: D. solanacea H.B.K.

Size and area: More than 30 spp. recognized from Central and South America.

Dunalia Spr. Pug. 2: 25. 1815 (Rubiaceae).

Type sp.: D. tuberosa Spr.

Dunalia Spr. was used only up to 1839 (Dietrich, Syn. 1), but abandoned in favor of Lucya DC., nom. conserv.

Dunalia R. Br. in Salt, Voy. Abyss. App. IV p. LXIV. 1814, nom. nudum (= Torenia L.)

Dierbachia Spr. Syst. 1: 512, 676. 1825.

Type sp.: D. solanacea (H.B.K.) Spr.

As Dunalia H.B.K. was a later homonym of Dunalia Spr., Sprengel substituted for it the new generic name Dierbachia Spr. Only O. Kuntze followed him, transferring consequently 8 species of Dunalia to Dierbachia (Rev. Gen. 2: 451. 1891), to which he added 4 other combinations by reducing Acnistus to Dierbachia (Rev. Gen. 3: 220. 1893).

Discussion. — Though Kuntze was of course quite right in recognizing that Dierbachia was, strictly, the right name for the genus, the use of the name Dunalia has been almost universal in Solanaceous treatments and leading botanical handbooks. It was e.g. used by G. Don (Gen. Hist. 1830), Endlicher (Gen. 1839), Miers (in Hook. J. Bot. 1845, 1848; Ill. 1850), Dunal (in DC. Prodr. 1852), Bentham & Hook. f. (Gen. Pl. 1876), v. Wettstein (in Engler & Prantl, Pflanzenfamilien 1891), and more recently by Dammer (Bot. Jahrb. 50: 1913), MacBride (Publ. Field Mus. 1930) and Sleumer (Lilloa 23: 1950). The latter therefore showed the desirability to conserve it (Lilloa 23: 118. 1950). Contrarily Dierbachia has been out of use for more than a century, Kuntze's work excepted. Nomenclature of South American botany would certainly be rather upset if Dunalia is not conserved. Moreover, in that case at least 18 new combinations will be necessary in Dierbachia whereas if Dunalia is conserved none is needed. Taking further into consideration that one of the homonyms is a nomen nudum, and that the other has — after Kuntze's time — officially been rejected in the Rules, we feel satisfied that a proposal for conserving Dunalia H.B.K. is worthy of consideration by the Paris Congress.

Proposed by: Ch. Baehni (Genève) & H. Sleumer (Leiden).

Proposition n. 95

Proposition pour la conservation du genre 3794 **Cyclocarpa** de la famille des *Leguminosae (Papil.).*

Cyclocarpa Afz. ex Bak. in Oliv., Fl. Trop. Afr. **2**: 151. 1871 versus: *Cyclocarpa* Miquel, Fl. Ned. Ind. **3**: 339. 1855.

Cyclocarpa Afz. *Leguminosae (Papil.)*

Adopté par: Urban, Jahrb. Bot. Gart. Berlin **3**: 248 (1884); Engler et Prantl, Nat. Pfl.-fam. **3** (3): 320 (1894); Dalla Torre et Harms, Gen. Siph. no. 3794 (1901); Th. et H. Durand, Syll. Fl. Congol.: 138 (1909); Harms in Engl., Pflanz. Af. **3** (1): 613 (1915); Gagnepain in Lecomte, Fl. Indo-Chine: 554 (1920); Hutch et Dalz., Fl. W. Trop. Afr. **1** (2): 416 (1928); Bak. f., Leg. Trop. Afr.: 301 (1929).

1 espèce paléotropicale: *C. stellaris* Afz. ex Bak., l.c., du Sierra Leone.

Cyclocarpa Miquel *Cyperaceae.*

Erreur de graphie non intentionnelle pour *Cyclocampe* Steud., Syn. Pl. Glum. **2**: 156. 1855. Les descriptions génériques et spécifiques publiées par Miquel sont la copie presque textuelle, avec référence, des descriptions de Steudel. Le type de la seule espèce citée est le même pour les deux auteurs: Ile Waigiou (Nouvelle Guinée), *Urville* s.n. Il s'agit bien d'une erreur de graphie puisque Steudel indique clairement l'étymologie de *Cyclocampe,* nom utilisé par *Benth.* et *Hook.,* Gen. Pl. **3**: 1063 (1883); *Engl.* et *Prantl,* Nat. Pfl.-fam. **2** (2): 115 (1887); *Dalla Torre* et *Harms,* Gen. Siph., no. 476 (1900).

Proposé par: J. Léonard (Bruxelles).

Proposal no. 96

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name **Xerocomus** Quél. versus *Versipellis* Quél. (Fungi).

Nomen conservandum: *Xerocomus* Quél. *apud* Moug. & Ferry, Champ in Louis, Dept. Vosges, Fl. Vosges 447. 1887.

T.: *Boletus subtomentosus* L. ex Fr.

Nomen rejiciendum: *Versipellis* Quél., Ench. Fungi 157. 1886.

T.: *Boletus subtomentosus* L. ex Fr.

Information & Argumentation: Published in a mimeographed document, submitted to the Rapporteur-Général, the Special Committee for Fungi and to all other botanists on request (Address: Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia, Bogor, Indonesia).

Proposed by: M. A. Donk, Bogor.

MODIFICACIONES AL CODIGO INTERNACIONAL DE NOMENCLATURA BOTÁNICA*

Proposals nos. 97-98 submitted to the Paris Congress**

por

Antonio Ponce de León y Aymé y Manuel Mencia y García

Proposición no. 97

ESTRUCTURACION DEL CAPITULO IV DEL CODIGO INTERNACIONAL DE NOMENCLATURA TAXONOMICA BOTANICA.

Por cuanto:

La sección 3 del Capítulo III del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica guarda una relación mas estrecha con las secciones 5, 6 y 7 del propio capítulo que con las que le son contiguas.

Por cuanto:

La reunión de los preceptos de las citadas secciones forman un cuerpo de artículos con homogenidad e importancia suficientes para constituir un capítulo.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que se estructure el Capítulo IV del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica con las cuatro secciones indicadas, en la forma siguiente:

CAPITULO IV

DE LA PRIORIDAD Y VALIDEZ DE LAS DENOMINACIONES DE LOS TAXA.

Sección 1. — Limitación del principio de prioridad: punto de partida de las publicaciones válidas. Conservación de nombres.

Sección 2. — Condiciones y fechas de las publicaciones efectivas.

Sección 3. — Condiciones y fechas de las publicaciones válidas.

Sección 4. — Citación de autores y referencias de precisión.

Notas:

Los artículos marcados con los números 22 y 23 de la sección anteriormente 3, que ahora será la 1 del Capítulo IV, llevarán los números 39 y 40 respectivamente.

El artículo 24 del antiguo Código se desdoblará en dos, el 41 y el 42, como podrá verse seguidamente.

Los artículos que forman las secciones 5, 6 y 7 del Capítulo III del antiguo Código,

Proposal no. 97

STRUCTURE DU CHAPITRE IV DU CODE INTERNATIONAL DE LA NOMENCLATURE TAXONOMIQUE BOTANIQUE.

Vu que:

La section 3 du Chapitre III du Code International de Nomenclature Botanique se rapporte plus étroitement aux sections 5, 6, et 7 de ce même chapitre qu'a celles qui la précèdent et suivent.

Vu que:

La réunion des prescriptions des sections indiquées forment un ensemble d'articles homogènes et suffisamment importants pour constituer un Chapitre à part.

Nous formulons la suivante

PROPOSITION

De formuler le Chapitre IV du Code International de la Nomenclature Taxonomique Botanique des quatre sections indiqueés comme suit:

CHAPITRE IV

DE LA PRIORITÉ ET VALIDITÉ DES DENOMINATIONS DES TAXA

Section 1. — Limitation du principe de priorité: point de départ des publications valides. Conservation des noms.

Section 2. — Conditions et dates des publications effectives.

Section 3. — Conditions et dates des publications valides.

Section 4. — Citations d'auteurs et rapports de précision.

Notes:

Les articles marqués des numéros 22 et 23 de la section précédente (3), laquelle sera désormais la 1re du Chapitre IV, porteront les numéros 39 et 40 respectivement.

L'article 24 de l'ancien Code sera divisé en deux, le 41 et 42, comme on verra de ce qui suit.

Les articles des sections 5, 6 et 7 du Chapitre III de l'ancien Code, lesquels sont

* Formando parte del cuerpo de modificaciones al Código por A. Ponce de Léon y M.T. Alvarez.

** The Spanish text of this proposal is the primary one.

que ahora son las 2, 3 y 4 del Capítulo IV, tendrán los números, al correrse la numeración, que comenzarán en el 43, en lugar de en el 39, y terminarán en el 64, en lugar de en el 60.

Proposición no. 98

SEPARACION EN DOS PARTES DEL ARTICULO 24 DEL CODIGO.

Por cuanto:

El artículo 24 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica no hace una distinción entre la razón que obliga a admitir *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"* y la finalidad que anima el establecimiento de *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"*.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que se sustituya el artículo 24 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica, por los artículos 41 y 42 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica, cuyos textos pueden verse a continuación.

Art. 41.

Para evitar desventajosos cambios en la nomenclatura, no obstante el caracter de las prescripciones de esta Código, no se tendrá en cuenta el principio de prioridad en el caso de ciertos nombres genéricos que, por haber estado empleándose constantemente, deben estimarse como consagrados por el uso.

A tal efecto, este Código proveerá una lista de nombres genéricos para ser retenidos como excepción, bajo el título de *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"*. Tales nombres se preferirán unicamente si han estado en uso general durante cincuenta años despues de su publicación, o cuando han sido usados en reconocidos importantes trabajos floristicos antes del año 1890.

Observación.

Las notas 1, 2, 3, 4, con todos sus ejemplos, del artículo 24 anterior, se trasladarán integramente al nuevo artículo 41.

Art. 42.

A fin de ir fijando cada vez más los nombres asignados a las familias que han sido formados de acuerdo con los preceptos del Código, en sustitución de aquellos que no ajustándose a lo establecido resultan incorrectos, este Código proveerá una lista de los nombres de familias que deben preferirse, bajo el título de *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"*.

maintenant les 2, 3 et 4 du Chapitre IV, auront de nouveaux numéros en continuant la numération qui commencera par le 43 au lieu du 39 et finira par le 64 au lieu du 60.

Proposal no. 98

DIVISION EN DEUX PARTIES DE L'ARTICLE 24 DU CODE

Vu que:

Dans l'article 24 du Code International de la Nomenclature Botanique on ne fait pas de distinction entre la nécessité d'admettre *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"* et le but des *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"*.

Nous formulons la suivante

PROPOSITION

De substituer à l'article 24 du Code International de la Nomenclature Botanique les articles 41 et 42 du Code International de la Nomenclature Taxonomique Botanique, dont voici les textes.

Art. 41.

Pour éviter de changements sans aventages dans la Nomenclature, malgré le caractère des prescriptions de ce Code, le principe de priorité ne s'appliquera pas dans le cas de certains noms génériques qui, employés constamment, doivent s'estimer comme consacrés par l'usage.

A tel effet, à ce Code présentera une liste de noms génériques devant être conservés comme exceptions, intitulés *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"*.

Ces noms sont de préférence ceux dont l'emploi est devenu général dans les cinquante ans après leur publication, ou, qui ont été employés dans d'importants travaux floristiques d'avant l'an 1890.

Observation.

Les notes 1, 2, 3, 4, avec tous les exemples de l'article 24 précédent, seront transférés intégralement au nouvel article 41.

Art. 42.

Afin d'adopter de plus en plus les noms des familles aux prescriptions du Code, remplaçant ceux qui ne suivent pas les règles établies, ce Code présentera une liste des noms de familles qui sont acceptés de préférence à d'autres, intitulés *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"*.

Office

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

Membership Fees

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

	$	£	D.fl.	Sw.Kr.
A. Individual Persons				
Regular Members	3.—	1.1.—	11.40	15.90
Associate Members	1.—	—.7.—	3.80	5.30
B. Institutes, Societies, etc.				
Supporting Members	50.—	17.10.—	190.—	265.—
Regular Members	25.—	8.15.—	95.—	132.50
Associate Members	10.—	3.10.—	38.—	53.—

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

TAXON

Volume I, nos. 1—9, 1951—52. Backnumbers (no. 3 excepted) are available for all members wanting to complete their possibly incomplete copies. Members who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 January 1953 can buy volume I (no. 3 excepted) against $ 2.— per copy. The editors regret that the stock of Taxon no. 3 is exhausted.

Regnum Vegetabile

Vol. 1. *Seventh International Botanical Congress, Section Nomenclature;* report by J. Lanjouw, Rapporteur-Général *(reprint).*

This report has *not yet* been published. This delay is caused by technical difficulties encountered by the Stockholm Editorial Committee with regard to the preparation of the entire Stockholm Proceedings.

Vol. 2. *Index Herbariorum.*

Part I *The Herbaria of the world.*
Second, revised, edition, 1 January 1954.
Institutional members and regular individual members: **free.**
Others: D. fl. 13.30.

Part II *Collectors.* First instalment (A-D), 1 January 1954.
Institutional members: **free.**
Regular Individual members: D. fl. 7.60 ($ 2.—; sh. 15/-).
Others: D. fl. 14.50.

Vol. 3. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.*

Cheap edition, 15½ x 24 cm, buckram, 1 December 1953.
Regular individual members: D. fl. 5.50 ($ 1.40, sh. 10/-).
Others: D. fl. 10.— (Not yet available for non-members residing in the U.S.A.).

REGIONAL TREASURERS

Austria: Dr K. H. Rechinger, Naturhistorisches Museum, Botanische Abteilung, Burgring 7, Wien.

Belgium: Prof. W. Robyns, Rijksplantentuin, 236 Koninklijke Straat, Brussel.

Canada: Prof. J. Rousseau, Montreal Botanical Garden, 4101 Sherbrooke Street East, Montreal, Que.

Egypt: Mr Mohammed Drar, Fouad I Agricultural Museum, Dokki, Cairo.

Germany: Dr Walter Domke, Staatsinstitut für Allgemeine Botanik, Jungiusstrasse 6, Hamburg 36.

Great Britain and British Overseas Territories: Mr A. A. Bullock, The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

Italy: Prof. R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico dell'Universitá, Via Lamarmora no. 4, Firenze.

Netherlands: The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht. Bankers: Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, giro 7247.

Norway: Prof. K. Faegri, Universitet I Bergen, Botanisk Museum, Bergen.

Sweden: Mr Bo Peterson, Botaniska Museet, Lund. Postgiro 43.35.39.

U.S.A.: Dr R. C. Rollins, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Mass.

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.